

BCS-Universal Ratios within the Van Hove Scenario

R. Baquero and D. Quesada^a

Departamento de Física, CINVESTAV, A. Postal 14-740, 07000 México D.F.

C. Trallero-Giner

Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de La Habana, 10400 Habana, Cuba

Within conventional superconductivity, BCS theory represents a well defined weak-coupling limit. The central result are the Universal Ratios which do not depend on physical parameters of the particular superconductor under study. Several attempts have been made to introduce the van Hove Scenario within BCS theory but in none of them the Universal Ratios of conventional superconductivity appear to be a number independent of parameters. This fact prevents the precise definition of a deviation from the BCS value for a particular superconductor. This concept is at the basis of several applications of BCS theory in characterizing conventional superconductors. We define a system that constitutes a weak coupling limit that retains the essential features of the high-T_c oxides and which does not differ in any essential way from other models widely used in generalizations of BCS theory to high-T_c superconductors. The difference is that we found a natural way of dealing with the mathematics of the problem so as to get Universal Ratios in the same sense as in conventional superconductivity. This formulation could play an analogous role as the original BCS theory played in conventional superconductivity.

Abstract

PACS: 74.20.Fg

Typeset using REVTeX

Within conventional superconductivity (CS), BCS theory describes the physics of the Cooper pairs. In its traditional formulation a Cooper pair is a bound state formed by two electrons at the Fermi level with opposite crystal momentum and spin that attract themselves via a constant potential. BCS theory neglects several important features of CS but retains the essential ones and represents a well defined weak-coupling formulation of the problem. BCS is a one-parameter theory. The behavior of a particular superconductor is determined solely by the product $N(0)V$, where V is the value of the attraction constant potential between the two electrons that constitute a Cooper pair and $N(0)$ is the electronic density of states (DOS) at the Fermi level, E_F , in the normal state. The DOS is assumed to be constant in the energy interval around E_F , where V , is considered to be different from zero. According to this model [1], there is a law of corresponding states in the sense that, if $A(T)$ is a physical quantity at a temperature T , then $A(T)/A(0)$ or $A(T)/A(T_c)$ (whichever exists) is a universal function of the reduced temperature $t \equiv T/T_c$, where T_c is the critical temperature. This law is approximately followed by conventional superconductors (CSr). A central result of this theory are the Universal Ratios (UR). These relate thermodynamic quantities among themselves in a universal way, *i. e.* they are equal to the same number for every possible superconductor.

When compared to experiment, BCS turns out not to be an exact theory of CS. Deviations from it are frequent in all but some of the weak coupling CSr as Al, In, and Sn. Since it is a precisely established limit, the deviations from it do have a well defined physical meaning. This theory is useful as a point of reference and as a tool to study different, more complicated physical situations in a transparent and easy way from which trends can be established. It is important to recall that, in the spirit of the theoretical treatment of CS, the deviations from BCS theory characterize the particular superconductor, not the theory. The validity of BCS theory itself is based on its approximate description of the most important experimental trends and on its characterization as a well-defined weak coupling limit. This is a very important point for this letter. The precise many-body theory of the electron-phonon (e-ph) CS is described through the so called Eliashberg gap Equations [2]

which give a detailed account of the experimental results found so far for e-ph CSr.

In this letter, we want to start with a precise definition of a weak-coupling limit for high-T_c superconductivity (HTCS). It will not be essentially different from the models used widely in the literature. The difference is that we found a natural way of dealing with the mathematics of the problem so as to get UR in the same sense as in CS. The mathematical approximations that we use are essentially of the same kind as the ones used by other authors. Nevertheless, we keep always in mind that the idea is to follow very closely the original BCS formulation so as to get universal behaviors and UR.

As a final result, we will get for the UR numbers that do not depend on any parameter characterizing the superconductor under study allowing the precise definition of deviations from the BCS values for any given superconductor. The new numbers do differ from the ones predicted by the original BCS theory. This is obviously due to the 2D formulation, *i. e.* to the introduction of the van Hove singularity (vHS). We speculate about the possible meaning of the new numbers as compared to the original ones by relating them to the trends observed in CS for T_c associated to the symmetry of the wave function (*i. e.* whether it is s, p or d) for the electrons occupying energies around the Fermi level.

At the end, we will not pretend to have a precise explanation of the copper oxides but a precisely defined weak coupling limit of high-T_c superconductivity in the same spirit of conventional BCS theory. Such a formulation could play a somehow similar role in HTCS as BCS played in CS and does not exist at present in the literature although some generalization of BCS theory do.

Several authors [3–10] have attempted to extend BCS theory to describe the HTCS. Essentially the efforts were directed to include the vHS in the DOS into the otherwise standard BCS theory. These formulations lead to quantitative different results from those obtained using a constant DOS and give an approximate explanation of most of the experimental results obtained for HTCS. In some cases the deviations found are considerable and leave little doubt that BCS theory is insufficient to give a detailed explanation of HTCS. Strictly speaking this is also the case in CS [11,12].

In all these attempts one of the efforts is to get an expression for the BCS UR. The most popular of them are

$$R_1 \equiv \frac{2\Delta(0)}{K_B T_c}, \quad (1)$$

$$R_2 \equiv \frac{\Delta C(T_c)}{C_n(T_c)}, \quad (2)$$

and

$$R_3 \equiv \frac{H_c(0)}{\sqrt{N(0)\Delta(0)}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta(0)$ is the superconducting energy gap per electron at $T=0$, K_B is the Boltzmann's constant, $\Delta C(T_c) \equiv C_s(T_c) - C_n(T_c)$ is the difference between the electronic specific heat per unit volume in the superconducting and the normal state at $T = T_c$, $H_c(0)$ is the thermodynamic critical magnetic field at $T = 0$. In the free electron approximation, not suitable for HTCS, $C_n(T_c) = \gamma T_c$, with $\gamma = 2\pi^2 K_B^2 N(0)/3$. It is important to remark that the magnitude $N(0)$ has no analog in HTCS where the strong variation of the DOS near E_F is the central point. In this sense there is no expression in HTCS that would be exactly equivalent to R_3 as R_2 and R_1 are. Nevertheless we will show below that an analogous expression is possible and can be used as a UR.

For CS, BCS predicts $R_1 = 3.52$, $R_2 = 1.43$ and $R_3 = \sqrt{4\pi}$. For HTCS, different authors have obtained that these ratios are not universal, they are given as functions of "reasonable values" for some parameters. Sometimes it is not clear that these have a precise meaning consistent with the 2D formulation as, for example, the 3D Debye frequency. For this reason, it is not possible to define in a precise way what a deviation from the BCS value is for a particular superconductor. This is a very useful concept within the conventional formulation of the theory.

Furthermore, usually, research is presented with the intention either to justify or to reject BCS theory as a detailed explanation for HTCS. This is not the spirit in the conventional theory. Nevertheless, several authors [3,5–8,10], based on the way in which they look at the

approximate account of the available experimental results that they get from their generalization, rise a conclusion for or against BCS as if one could pretend that it is an exact theory. There is also an undeclared trend to associate it with the electron-phonon interaction although actually no specification about the mechanism is really necessary.

In conclusion, the attempts done so far to extend BCS theory to HTCS have failed in getting UR, on one side, and have been usually addressed with the idea of presenting a full explanation of the physics of HTCS which is contrary to the spirit of BCS theory, on the other. BCS, we emphasize, neglects from the outset several important details, as the many-body effects of the electron-electron attraction, and cannot, as a natural result, give account of all the experimental details of the phenomenon of superconductivity. For these reasons, the overall conclusion one could draw from the research done so far in this direction is slightly undefined. Here we make an attempt to settle this points to some extend.

Let us now define what we call the weak-coupling limit. The scenario in which superconductivity takes place in the copper oxides lies on the copper-oxygen planes. We start by setting a tight-binding Hamiltonian of a plane of Cu and O atoms forming a square lattice. We consider first nearest neighbors interaction with τ , the hopping parameter. The dispersion relation is given by

$$\epsilon_{\vec{k}} = -2\tau(\cos(k_x a) + \cos(k_y a)). \quad (4)$$

Here the $k_{x,y}$ are the components of the two dimensional reciprocal lattice vector and a is the lattice constant. We take the origin of the energy at the Fermi level. The single spin DOS can be obtained by integrating in the 2D first Brillouin zone and is equal to

$$N(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2\tau} \mathcal{K} \left[\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{\epsilon}{4\tau} \right)^2} \right],$$

where $\mathcal{K}(m)$ is the elliptic integral of the first type. We will not need any value for τ for the purpose of getting the UR. Nevertheless, τ can be taken equal to 0.25 eV in agreement with Markiewicz [13] who considers that this parameter can be set anywhere from 0.25 to 0.5 eV.

This gives a bandwidth $D = 8\tau = 2eV$ which is in agreement with band structure calculations [14] and with ARPES results [15]. While a more realistic model can be constructed by including the second nearest neighbors the present model has the advantage that analytic results can be derived. Inclusion of the above term will lead to small modifications of the UR. The asymptotic form for $\mathcal{K}(m)$ in the neighborhood of the singularity can be used to get for the single spin DOS

$$N(\epsilon) \approx \frac{1}{4\pi^2\tau} \ln \left| \frac{16}{\frac{\epsilon}{4\tau}} \right|. \quad (5)$$

This result has been obtained by several other authors [3–9]. We will use this approximation below.

The gap equation can be obtained in a standard way

$$\Delta_{\vec{k}}(T) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{k}'} V_{\vec{k},\vec{k}'} \frac{\Delta_{\vec{k}'}}{\sqrt{\epsilon_{\vec{k}'}^2 + \Delta_{\vec{k}'}^2(T)}} \tanh \left[\frac{\sqrt{\epsilon_{\vec{k}'}^2 + \Delta_{\vec{k}'}^2(T)}}{2K_B T} \right]. \quad (6)$$

With the standard approximation for the e-e attraction potential,

$$V_{\vec{k}',\vec{k}} = \begin{cases} -V & \text{if } |\epsilon_{\vec{k}}|, |\epsilon_{\vec{k}'}| < \epsilon_0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where ϵ_0 is a cut-off energy that we do not associate to any particular mechanism. The 2D-BCS gap equation follows directly

$$\frac{2}{V} = \int_{-\epsilon_0}^{\epsilon_0} d\epsilon \frac{N(\epsilon)}{\sqrt{\epsilon^2 + \Delta^2(T)}} \tanh \left[\frac{\sqrt{\epsilon^2 + \Delta^2(T)}}{2K_B T} \right]. \quad (7)$$

We will show now how we do get UR. We will deal first with the gap and T_c . From our expressions for the single spin DOS (5) and the equation for the gap (7), we can obtain an expression for T_c and $\Delta(0)$. In deriving these equations several different approximations can be taken and different ways lead to essentially the same result but expressed analytically differently. One has to bear in mind that the goal is to obtain a UR and therefore that the expression for $\Delta(0)$ that we want has to differ from the one for T_c only by a proportionality constant. Such expressions can be obtained quite straightforwardly to give

$$K_B T_c = 32\tau \exp \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{8\pi^2\tau}{V} + \ln^2\left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{64\tau}\right)} - 1 \right), \quad (8)$$

for the critical temperature and

$$\Delta(0) = 64\tau \exp \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{8\pi^2\tau}{V} + \ln^2\left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{64\tau}\right)} - 1 \right) \quad (9)$$

for the gap at zero temperature. Then

$$\frac{2\Delta(0)}{K_B T_c} = 4 \quad (10)$$

which is slightly higher than the BCS-value of 3.52. The difference comes obviously from the inclusion of the vHS. We will comment on it below.

We get now the ratio R_2 for the specific heat jump at T_c defined above in Eq (2). We start from the expression

$$\Delta C(T_c) = \frac{1}{2K_B T_c} \frac{d\Delta^2(T)}{dT} \Big|_{T_c} \int_{-\epsilon_0}^{\epsilon_0} d\epsilon N(\epsilon) f(\epsilon) (1 - f(\epsilon)), \quad (11)$$

where $f(\epsilon)$ is the Fermi-Dirac distribution function. From Eq (11) we get immediately

$$\frac{\Delta C(T_c)}{C_n} = \frac{3}{\pi^2 K_B^2 T_c} \frac{d\Delta^2}{dT} \Big|_{T_c}, \quad (12)$$

Since a numerical calculation of Eq (7) gives us a behavior for the gap function $\Delta(T)$ very similar to the conventional BCS one, we have used the BCS value for the derivative [1]

$$\frac{d\Delta^2(T)}{dT} \Big|_{T_c} = -9.61 K_B^2 T_c \quad (13)$$

from which we get directly another UR

$$\left| \frac{\Delta C(T_c)}{C_n} \right| = 2.92 \quad (14)$$

which is about twice the BCS value.

The thermodynamic critical magnetic field, $H_c(0)$, can be calculated from the 2D thermodynamic relation:

$$\frac{H_c^2(T)}{4\pi} = F_n(T) - F_s(T) \quad (15)$$

where F_n (F_s) is the free energy in the normal (superconducting) state.

After some straightforward but slightly lengthy algebra, we arrive at the expression

$$\frac{H_c^2(0)}{4\pi} = N_0\Delta^2(0)\left(\frac{4}{3} - \ln\frac{\Delta(0)}{64\tau}\right) > \frac{7N_0\Delta^2(0)}{3} \quad (16)$$

where we have used, $\ln x < x - 1$ for $x < 1$ and $N_0 = \frac{1}{8\pi^2\tau}$. Therefore

$$\frac{H_c^2(0)}{N_0\Delta^2(0)} > \frac{28\pi}{3} \quad (17)$$

and the lower limit gives us again a UR

$$\frac{H_c(0)}{\sqrt{N_0}\Delta(0)} = 5.41. \quad (18)$$

Here we have to realize that N_0 is not the DOS value at E_F as in CS.

In conclusion, in this letter we have considered the plane of Cu and O atoms where superconductivity takes place in the HTCS. A tight-binding formulation of the problem has allowed us to get the DOS in agreement with previous authors. Since BCS theory has been so useful in CS, based on its universality and its simplicity, we found natural to attempt a similar formulation valid for HTCS. Our result differs from previous work. Our main conclusion are the UR given by Eqs.(10), (14) and (18). We want now to speculate on the reason to get higher numbers than in the conventional theory. In conventional BCS theory, the trend of T_c , $\Delta(0)$ and the UR with the behavior of the electronic structure was not usually considered since the only electronic parameter was the DOS at E_F that entered always as a constant. A more careful look at the symmetry of the wave function of the electrons at the Fermi level (whether they are s-, s-p or d-like) shows that to higher values of the quantities mentioned above corresponds a more localized (in the sense stated above) wave function. In other words, a system with electrons described by s-waves at E_F should have a lower T_c as compared to another system where the electrons at this energy are described by d-waves. As an example, Al (s-wave) has a lower T_c than Nb (d-wave). This has nothing to do, obviously, with the symmetry of the order parameter. We can build the speculation that **the more localized the wave function is, the higher the T_c , $\Delta(0)$ and the UR.** In this sense

one could expect the UR for HTCS to be higher than the corresponding ones for CS, in the sense that the phenomenon takes place in a plane which is more localized than a 3D space, where electrons with wave functions of p and d character are present at the Fermi level. We repeat that this relationship is somehow speculative. The real sharp fact is that the UR are possible to formulate in a reasonable way and turn out to be higher numbers. We expect that they will play the same role in HTCS as they did in CS. The mathematical details of this formulation will be published elsewhere.

REFERENCES

- ^(a) *Permanent address: Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de La Habana, 10400 Habana, Cuba*
- ¹ J.R. Schrieffer, *Theory of Superconductivity*, W.A. Benjamin, Inc. (1964); G. Rickayzen, *Theory of Superconductivity*, Interscience Pub., (1965).
- ² G.M. Eliashberg, Soviet Phys. JETP **11**, 696 (1960)
- ³ J. Labbe and J. Bok, Europhys. Lett. **3** , 1225 (1987)
- ⁴ J.E. Dzyaloshinskii, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **46**, 97 (1987); JETP Lett. **46** , 118 (1987).
- ⁵ R.S. Markiewicz, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **2** ,665 (1990); Physica C **168**, 195 (1990).
- ⁶ C.C. Tsuei *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2724 (1990); D. M. Newns *et al.*, Comments Cond. Mat. Phys. **15**, 273 (1992).
- ⁷ J.M. Getino, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 597 (1993)
- ⁸ A. Gama Goicochea, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 6864 (1994).
- ⁹ J. Bok, Physica C **209**, 107 (1993).
- ¹⁰ X. Tiefeng and B. Guiru, Z. Phys. B **89**, 35 (1992)
- ¹¹ J.P. Carbotte, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 1027 (1990); J.M. Daams *et al.*, J. Low Temp. Phys. **55**, 1 (1984); H.G. Zarate and J.P. Carbotte, J. Low Temp. Phys. **55**, 67 (1984).
- ¹² R. Baquero and J.P. Carbotte, J. Low Temp. Phys. **51**, 135 (1983)
- ¹³ R. S. Markiewicz, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **1**, 9811 (1989); Physica C **177**, 171 (1991).
- ¹⁴ E. B. Stechel and D. R. Jenninson, Phys. Rev B **38**, 4632 (1988).
- ¹⁵ J. C. Campuzano, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2308 (1990); C. G. Olson *et al.*, Phys.

Rev. B **42**, 381 (1990); D.M. King *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 3298 (1994); K. Gofron *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 3302 (1994).